Interim VPDUE Bill Ladusaw  
McHenry Library  

RE: Draft Educational Effectiveness Report

Dear Bill,
I am writing with the summation of the Senate responses to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) essays on educational effectiveness. The Senate was impressed by the overall quality of the essays, the seriousness of their tone, and the efforts made to address the difficult questions posed by the earlier WASC review. Some issues raised in the WASC documents or responses, such as more coordinated campus initiative in obtaining grants and reviews of divisions as well as programmatic review of divisions, warrant further discussion but the treatment these topics received in the essays was appropriate for the stage of development.

First, there is strong support for increased use of financial and effectiveness information in the academic planning process. One example cited was the need for financial data in the review of academic programs. While we anticipate some additional data available with the program reviews beginning this year, the nature of the data are not yet commonly known and we do not yet know how this will effect program assessment. However, the cost of collecting, collating and interpreting data should also be considered. It may be appropriate to include more discussion in the essays regarding this point. Along the same lines the use and review of student survey forms (NSSE and UCUES) were raised.

Second, it was noted that the campus makes a number of claims to diversity but this is not reflected in the essays. One statement to this effect in the Graduate Education essay is unsupported and not developed. If, as many on this campus do, we feel that diversity is critical to our campus, greater incorporation of this principle in the essay would be very appropriate.

Third, the quality of undergraduate education has been strained by the recent budget cuts and this burden falls hardest in the areas the senior exit requirement and faculty-student interaction. How these are handled in the next few years may be critical. The Committee on Teaching and the Center for Teaching Excellence are charged with improving the instructional component. Both should be seen as assisting in both undergraduate and graduate education and the essays could show ways their involvement could be enhanced.

Fourth, the role of graduate education on the undergraduate experience could be seen as less oppositional, despite the views taken by some of the WASC members. Highly qualified applicants to a university often base their choice on the reputation of the campus, which in large part rests on the presence of thriving graduate programs.
Therefore, graduate programs indirectly improve the quality of the undergraduates we attract to this campus. Graduate courses are often tapped by outstanding undergraduates to further their challenge. The allocation of resources and the choices made in which programs to promote will be difficult but crucial to overall success.

Fifth, the suggestions that we switch some of our admissions emphasis to **transfer students** does not seem to be supported by the data. As CAFA points out, virtually all eligible transfers were admitted and 900 enrolled. This community may simply have insufficient transfer students upon which to draw and unless there are plans of attracting transfer students from much further outside the surrounding areas, this shift may not be feasible.

A number of the committees made specific editorial changes and their letters are attached for your benefit.

Sincerely,

Alison Galloway, Chair
Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

cc: Acting Chancellor Chemers
Interim CPEVC Delaney
Vice Chair Crosby
CAAD Chair Pandey
CAFA Chair Coe
CEP Chair Hughey
COR Chair Aissen
CPB Chair Koch
COT Chair McDowell
GC Chair Schumm
Appendix

1) The Undergraduate Engagement section notes that discovery seminars allow first-year students to work with permanent faculty but the Integrative Essay suggests that advanced graduate students could be outstanding instructors for these courses. The latter statement seems to contradict the actual purpose of these seminars even if graduate students would do a fine job. We need consistency here.

2) COT letter has lengthy editorial comments.